

SCALAR AND TENSORIAL TOPOLOGICAL MATTER COUPLED TO (2+1)-DIMENSIONAL GRAVITY: A. CLASSICAL THEORY AND GLOBAL CHARGES

R. B. Mann^{1,2,*} and Eugeniu M. Popescu^{2,†}

¹*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,*

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2J 2G9

²*Department of Physics, University of Waterloo,*

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

(Date: November 27th, 2005)

Abstract

We consider the coupling of scalar topological matter to (2+1)-dimensional gravity. The matter fields consist of a 0-form scalar field and a 2-form tensor field. We carry out a canonical analysis of the classical theory, investigating its sectors and solutions. We show that the model admits both BTZ-like black-hole solutions and homogeneous/inhomogeneous FRW cosmological solutions. We also investigate the global charges associated with the model and show that the algebra of charges is the extension of the Kač-Moody algebra for the field-rigid gauge charges, and the Virasoro algebra for the diffeomorphism charges. Finally, we show that the model can be written as a generalized Chern-Simons theory, opening the perspective for its formulation as a generalized higher gauge theory.

*Electronic address: rbmann@sciborg.uwaterloo.ca

†Electronic address: empopesc@uwaterloo.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite its apparent simplicity, and despite the fact that it has been shown to be exactly solvable in the absence of matter [1], coupling matter to (2+1)-dimensional gravity in the traditional way generally destroys its solvability properties. In this case the quantization process is once again faced with much the same issues as its (3+1)-dimensional counterpart.

In the attempts to study the quantization of (2+1)-dimensional gravity in the presence of matter, the BCEA model has emerged as one of the few theories in which matter can be coupled to gravity while still preserving the solvability inherited from the latter. Proposed originally as a soluble diffeomorphism invariant theory [2] and later studied in a slightly modified form in [3], the BCEA model is essentially a topological field theory in which 1-form matter fields are minimally coupled to gravity in the first-order formalism through the connection. Coupling matter to gravity in this non-traditional¹ way has the effect of introducing only a finite number of degrees of freedom in addition to those of pure gravity, such that the resulting phase-space of the theory remains finite-dimensional and hence solvable both classically and quantum mechanically.

What makes this model interesting from the physical viewpoint is the fact that for non-trivial topologies, it has non-trivial solutions. In particular, it has been shown that it admits as a solution the BTZ black-hole geometry [4] with the surprising result that the Noether charges in this case - the quasilocal energy and angular momentum - change roles as compared to their counterparts in Einsteinian gravity. Explicitly, the quasilocal energy in the BTZ theory is proportional to the quasilocal angular momentum parameter in Einsteinian gravity with negative cosmological constant, and vice-versa. Furthermore, it has been shown in [3] that the model can be written as a Chern-Simons theory with the group $I[ISO(2,1)]$ obtained directly from the Lie algebra of the constraints. Notwithstanding computational difficulties, this makes the model quantizable in a rather straightforward manner for any topology of relevance, and in particular for the topology of the BTZ black-hole solution mentioned earlier.

The BCEA theory, however, is not the only theory in which matter can be coupled min-

¹ We refer to the coupling of matter through the connection as ‘non-traditional’ as opposed to the ‘traditional’ coupling of matter to gravity through the metric in the metric formalism, or alternatively, through the triad and/or co-triad fields in the first-order formalism.

imally to gravitation in $(2+1)$ dimensions. Another obvious possibility is to construct a model where instead of coupling two 1-form matter fields to gravity as in the BCEA case, we couple to gravity a 2-form field and a 0-form field.

In the present paper we consider the latter kind of theory, which will subsequently be called the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory, and we compare its results to the corresponding results in the BCEA model. Of course, one expects the two theories to have strong similarities, and in the following we will show that indeed this is the case. Both theories admit the BTZ geometry as a solution, and both theories exhibit similar anomalies regarding the Noether charges. Nevertheless, there are also major differences between the two models. Aside from the fact that they have different constraint algebras, while the BCEA model can be written in a straightforward manner as a Chern-Simons theory with the group generated by its constraint algebra, for the new model the situation is more complicated and in fact, more interesting. In the latter case, the constraint algebra becomes insufficient for writing the theory as a Chern-Simons theory, and one has to make additional use of the quaternion algebra for this purpose. Needless to say, this approach of writing the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model as a Chern-Simons theory raises very interesting questions regarding the canonical analysis and the quantization of the model.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review briefly the relevant results of the BCEA theory, for the purpose of later comparison with corresponding results of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model, which is described in detail in Section III. In Section IV we discuss the classical sectors of the theory, and in Section V we discuss certain solutions of the theory that illustrate these sectors. In Section VI we discuss in detail the global gauge charges of the theory, and we determine the classical and operator version of the algebras of gauge and diffeomorphism charges. In Section VII we show that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory can be written as a generalized Chern-Simons theory in the manner described above, and in Section VIII we conclude with a discussion of the results and issues that emerge from our analysis.

II. REVIEW OF THE BCEA MODEL

In this section, we briefly review the relevant results of the BCEA theory as they pertain to the purpose of this paper. For more details, the reader should consult [3], [4].

The action of the BCEA model in the first order formulation has the expression:

$$S[B, C, E, A] = \int_M (E_i \wedge R^i[A] + B_i \wedge DC^i) \quad (1)$$

where M is a 3-dimensional non-compact spacetime with the topology $M=R \times S$, and S is a 2-dimensional spacelike surface. The fields E_i in (1) are $SO(2,1)$ 1-forms which, if invertible, correspond to the triads of the spacetime metric, and $R^i[A]$ are the curvature 2-forms associated to the $SO(2,1)$ connection 1-forms A^i , with the expression:

$$R^i[A] = dA^i + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} A_j \wedge A_k \quad (2)$$

The $SO(2,1)$ 1-forms B^i, C^i , are the topological matter fields that are coupled to the fields E^i, A^i of pure gravity, and DC^i is the covariant derivative of the field C^i , having the expression:

$$DC^i = dC^i + \epsilon^{ijk} A_j \wedge C_k \quad (3)$$

Throughout the entire paper we adopt the following index convention. Greek indices, taking the values 0, 1, 2, designate the spacetime components of tensors, and are raised and lowered by the spacetime metric $g_{\alpha,\beta}$. Latin lower case indices, also taking the values 0, 1, 2, are $SO(2,1)$ indices, and are raised and lowered by the $SO(2,1)$ metric $\eta_{ij} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1)$, and ϵ^{ijk} is the totally antisymmetric $SO(2,1)$ symbol with $\epsilon^{012}=1$. Any other type of indices that might appear in the paper will be appropriately explained in the context where they occur.

The action (1) yields, upon first order variation (and up to surface terms), the equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} R^i[A] &= 0 \\ DE^i + \epsilon^{ijk} B_j \wedge C_k &= 0 \\ DB^i = DC^i &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and is invariant under the following 12-parameter infinitesimal gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A^i &= D\tau^i \\ \delta B^i &= D\rho^i + \epsilon^{ijk} B_j \tau_k \\ \delta C^i &= D\lambda^i + \epsilon^{ijk} C_j \tau_k \\ \delta E^i &= D\beta^i + \epsilon^{ijk} (E_j \tau_k + B_j \lambda_k + C_j \rho_k) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where β^i , λ^i , ρ^i , τ^i are 0-form gauge parameters.

The $(2 + 1)$ canonical splitting induced by the topology of the manifold M yields four sets of constraints J^i , P^i , Q^i , R^i , which are enforced by the zeroth spacetime components of the form fields A^i , E^i , B^i , and C^i respectively, acting as Lagrange multipliers. The Lie algebra generated by these constraints is:

$$\begin{aligned} \{J^i, J^j\} &= \epsilon^{ijk} J_k; \quad \{J^i, P^j\} = \epsilon^{ijk} P_k; \quad \{J^i, Q^j\} = \epsilon^{ijk} Q_k \\ \{J^i, R^j\} &= \epsilon^{ijk} R_k; \quad \{Q^i, R^j\} = \epsilon^{ijk} P_k \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with the rest of the Poisson brackets being zero. Equations (6) can be recognized as the Lie algebra of the inhomogenized Poincaré group $I[ISO(2, 1)]$ [5]. The Hamiltonian of the system is zero on shell, since it depends only on the constraints, and consequently the constraints are preserved in time.

As mentioned earlier, the BCEA theory admits the BTZ black-hole geometry as a solution. Taking into account the symplectic structure generated by the BCEA action (1), the conserved charges for the BTZ black-hole in this theory are found to be [4]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{BCEA}} &= \frac{\pi \mathcal{J}}{l} \\ \mathcal{J}_{\text{BCEA}} &= -\pi \mathcal{M} l \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are respectively conserved mass and the angular momentum of the BTZ black-hole in Einsteinian gravity with negative cosmological constant, and l is related to the cosmological constant Λ through the relation:

$$\Lambda = -\frac{1}{l^2} \quad (8)$$

Note that the cosmological constant is a constant of integration in this theory, and not a parameter in the action.

III. THE $\Sigma\Phi EA$ MODEL

In this section, we define the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory and analyze its classical properties, highlighting both the similarities and the differences between this theory and the BCEA model.

A. Action, equations of motion and gauge symmetries

The action of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model is defined analogously to the BCEA model:

$$S[\Sigma, \Phi, E, A] = \int_M (E_i \wedge R^i[A] + \Sigma_i \wedge D\Phi^i) \quad (9)$$

where the fields E^i , A^i and the covariant derivative have the same significance as in the BCEA theory, and the fields Σ^i , Φ^i are now respectively $SO(2, 1)$ -valued 2-form and a 0-form matter fields coupled to gravity through the connection A^i in the covariant derivative.

Up to surface terms, the first order variation of the action (9) yields the equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} R^i[A] &= 0 \\ DE^i + \epsilon^{ijk} \Sigma_j \wedge \Phi_k &= 0 \\ D\Sigma^i = D\Phi^i &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which are, as expected, very similar to the equations of motion (5) of the BCEA theory.

The equations of motion (11) are invariant under the following infinitesimal gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A^i &= D\alpha^i \\ \delta \Phi^i &= \epsilon^{ijk} \Phi_j \alpha_k \\ \delta \Sigma^i &= D\gamma^i + \epsilon^{ijk} \Sigma_j \alpha_k \\ \delta E^i &= D\beta^i + \epsilon^{ijk} (E_j \alpha_k - \Phi_j \gamma_k) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with α^i , β^i 0-form and γ^i 1-form gauge parameters. It would appear from (12) that the equations of motion of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory are invariant under a 15-parameter set of gauge transformations. This is however not the case since the gauge transformations are themselves invariant under the infinitesimal “translation”:

$$\gamma'^i = \gamma^i + D\eta^i \quad (12)$$

which reduces the number of independent gauge parameters to 12.

Splitting the action (9) in accordance with the topology of the manifold $M = R \times S$, yields the expression:

$$S[\Sigma, \Phi, E, A] = \int_R dt \int_S d^2x [\tilde{E}_i^B \dot{A}_B^i + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\Sigma}_i \dot{\Phi}^i + A_{i0} J^i + E_{i0} P^i + \Sigma_{i0A} K^{iA}] \quad (13)$$

where Latin uppercase indices are spacelike indices taking the values 1, 2, tilded quantities are densitized fields with $\epsilon^{AB} = \epsilon^{0AB}$, and dotted quantities are the time derivatives of the corresponding fields. As expected, the spatial components of the form-fields form pairs of canonically conjugate variables, and the zeroth components of the fields act as Lagrange multipliers enforcing the constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} J^i &= \star(\hat{D}\hat{E}^i - \epsilon^{ijk}\hat{\Sigma}_j\hat{\Phi}_k) \\ P^i &= \star(R^i[\hat{A}]) \\ K^{iA} &= [\star(\hat{D}\hat{\Phi}^i)]^A \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $\star$ is the spatial Hodge dual and the caret signifies the projection of the corresponding quantity onto the spacelike surface S . We see from (14) that the model has 12 independent first-class constraints, consistent with the number of independent gauge parameters found earlier.

Relabeling the constraints K^{i1} and K^{i2} by Q^i and respectively R^i - the order of the relabeling will prove to be irrelevant - for easier comparison with the BCEA model, a tedious but straightforward calculation yields a Poisson constraint algebra almost identical to the constraint algebra (6). All the Poisson brackets of the constraints are identical to the corresponding brackets of the BCEA model except for the bracket of Q^i with R^i which is now given by the expression:

$$\{Q^i, R^j\} = 0 \tag{15}$$

Consequently, the constraint algebra of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model can be viewed as the Lie algebra of the (2+1)-dimensional Lorentz group $SO(2, 1)$ generated by $\{J^i\}$ inhomogeneized by three sets of Poincaré translation-like abelian generators $\{P^i\}$, $\{Q^i\}$, $\{R^i\}$ that also commute with each other. In the absence of any nomenclature regarding the particular types of inhomogenization of simple groups, we have decided to use for the group associated with the constraint algebra of this model the obvious notation $[3I]SO(2, 1)$, where $[1I]SO(2, 1) \equiv ISO(2, 1)$ is the (2+1)-dimensional Poincaré group.

One should note at this time the following interesting aspect of the constraints in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model. In the BCEA model both matter fields generate independent symmetries through the constraints Q^i , R^i . However in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model the symmetries associated with the matter fields are generated, surprisingly, only by the scalar fields Φ^i , as is clearly shown by (14). Both matter fields couple as expected to the symmetry generators P^i , but

in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory there are no symmetries generated exclusively by the 2-form matter fields Σ^i . This fact suggests that any nontrivial solution of the theory should have nontrivial scalar fields, at least globally if not locally. This is a specific characteristic of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model; no such argument regarding nontrivial solutions can be made for BCEA theory.

B. Degrees of freedom

At this time, a natural question to ask is whether the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory has any local degrees of freedom (introduced by the topological matter fields) or not. Since the answer to this question involves a detailed analysis of the constraints and symmetries determined earlier, we will list them below in explicit form, for future reference. With the relabeling of the K-constraints introduced in the previous subsection, the explicit form of the constraints (14) is given by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} J^i &= \partial_{[1} E_{2]}^i + \epsilon^{ijk} (A_{j[1} E_{k2]} - \Sigma_{j[12]} \Phi_k) \\ P^i &= \partial_{[1} A_{2]}^i + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} A_{j[1} A_{k2]} \\ Q^i &= \partial_1 \Phi^i + \epsilon^{ijk} A_{j1} \Phi_k \\ R^i &= \partial_2 \Phi^i + \epsilon^{ijk} A_{j2} \Phi_k \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the antisymmetrization involves only the arabic numeral indices designating the spatial components of the fields. The variables in (16) are invariant under the gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_a^i &= \partial_a \tau^i + \epsilon^{ijk} A_{ja} \tau_k \\ \delta \Phi^i &= \epsilon^{ijk} \Phi_j \tau_k \\ \delta \Sigma_{[ab]}^i &= \partial_{[a} \lambda_{b]}^i + \epsilon^{ijk} (A_{j[a} \lambda_{kb]} + \Sigma_{j[ab]} \tau_k) \\ \delta E_a^i &= \partial_a \beta^i + \epsilon^{ijk} (A_{ja} \beta_k + E_j \tau_k - \Phi_j \lambda_{ka}) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where once again, the antisymmetrization operation involves only the spatial indices of the fields $a, b = 1, 2$.

Returning now to the issue of the physical degrees of freedom, it is well-known that the major ingredients in determining the number of physical degrees of freedom (PDOF) of a system are the total number of canonical variables (CV), the total number of independent

first class (IFCC) and second class constraints (ISCC), and the total number of independent conditions one can impose on the system in order to fix the gauge (IGC). Once these ingredients are known, the number of physical degrees of freedom of the system is given by the relation [6]:

$$(\#PDOF) = (\#CV) - (\#IFCC) - (\#ISCC) - (\#IGC) \quad (18)$$

Therefore, in order to establish the number of physical degrees of freedom, and since the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory has no second class constraints¹, we need to determine the number of independent first class constraints and the corresponding number of independent gauge fixing conditions.

That such a step is necessary at this stage of the analysis becomes obvious if one attempts to determine the number of degrees of freedom based on the *prima facie* information contained in the above constraints and gauge symmetries. The total number of canonical variables as determined from (13) is $(\#CV) = 18$, and from (16) and (17), one would have twelve independent first class constraints $(\#IFCC) = 12$ and similarly twelve independent gauge fixing conditions $(\#IGC) = 12$. Under these circumstances, (18) would yield for the number of physical degrees of freedom of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory a negative number $(\#PDOF) = -6$. Such a result, while not impossible (for example in the case of (1+1)-dimensional gravity the number of physical degrees of freedom is also negative), is a very strong indication that the constraints and/or the gauge fixing conditions might not be all independent as assumed.

In order to establish whether this is indeed the case we proceed to investigate the constraints and the gauge fixing conditions separately.

(i). The constraints

The first thing that should be noted is the fact that the fields Φ^i which are scalar forms appear in two sets of the constraints (16), namely in Q^i and R^i , together with the spatial components of the spin connection, suggesting that these two constraints together with the constraints J^i might be connected. This is indeed the case, and using the cohomological properties of the exterior derivative it is not difficult to show

¹ For the purpose of this analysis we restrict ourselves to the Lagrangian formalism where no second class constraints are present in this model

that between these three sets of constraints one has the relation:

$$\partial_2 Q^i - \partial_1 R^i + \epsilon^{ijk}(P_j \Phi_k + A_{j2} Q_k - A_{j1} R_k) = 0 \quad (19)$$

where the equality in (19) is a strong equality, i.e. the above relation is also valid off-shell. Under these circumstances, and since the remaining constraints of the theory are independent, it follows that in reality there are only nine independent first class constraints instead of twelve, and consequently $(\#IFCC) = 9$.

(ii). The gauge fixing conditions

Once the number of independent first class constraints has been determined, the issue of finding the number of independent gauge fixing conditions is straightforward. It can be shown [6],[7] that for a gauge theory that obeys the Dirac conjecture, the number of such independent gauge fixing conditions is in fact necessarily identical to the number of independent first class constraints. Hence, for the particular case of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory $(\#IGC) = (\#IFCC) = 9$.

Introducing the number of independent first class constraints and gauge conditions determined above into (18), the revised calculation yields $(\#PDof) = 0$, which means that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory has no local physical degrees of freedom. Of course, this doesn't mean that the theory is necessarily trivial. It only means that it is a topological field theory, and like any other such topological theory it is locally trivial, while globally it can still have non-trivial physical degrees of freedom depending on the topology of the spacetime manifold.

IV. THE CLASSICAL SECTORS OF THE $\Sigma\Phi EA$ THEORY

Having established that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is a topological field theory, the next logical step is to determine and classify the distinct gauge-equivalent classes of solutions of the theory. For topological theories, since any such theory is locally trivial, any such classification is usually based on the analysis of global observables, or in other words, on the existence of global gauge invariant quantities, and in the general case the classification will be related to the existence of the Casimir invariants of the gauge algebra, and/or of other quantities that are constant along certain gauge orbits [8]. Therefore, in order to make such a classification possible, a natural approach would be to first determine a complete set of such global

observables.

However, compared to the case of the *BCEA* model, constructing global observables for the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is even in principle a highly nontrivial task. This is mainly due to the fact that the latter theory contains scalar and tensorial matter fields, and as such - to the best knowledge of the authors - it cannot be written as either a BF theory or as a Chern-Simons theory². Under these circumstances, none of the more traditional techniques are available in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory, and one must look elsewhere for the construction of such global observables³.

Nevertheless, it is still possible to develop a classification of the classical sectors of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory if one makes the essential observation that one can construct a very simple gauge invariant quantity using the fields Φ^i exclusively. This quantity is $\Phi^i\Phi_i$, and it is straightforward to check its gauge invariance by directly using the gauge transformations (12). Furthermore, one can also observe that the fields Φ transform non-trivially only under Lorentz transformations, and therefore we can view these fields as a Minkowskian "vector" $\Phi = (\Phi^i)$, whose magnitude $\Phi \cdot \Phi = \Phi^i\Phi_i$ is left invariant under the action of $SO(2,1)$.

It follows from the above considerations that the simplest criterion for classifying the solutions of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory should be based on the values of the invariant quantity $\Phi \cdot \Phi = \Phi^i\Phi_i$. As a Minkowskian vector, Φ can be timelike, spacelike, null or identically zero, corresponding to a magnitude $\Phi^i\Phi_i$ that is negative, positive or zero. The zero value of the magnitude is degenerate, in the sense that it contains the cases where Φ is null or identically zero, and in the null case, additional degeneracy arises from the existence of an extra parameter that specifies whether Φ is a futurelike or pastlike null vector. We will discuss each of these cases separately.

a. The case $\Phi \equiv 0$

In this case, the equations of motion (11) reduce to:

$$R^i[A] = 0; \quad DE^i = 0; \quad D\Sigma^i = 0 \quad (20)$$

and the classification of solutions can be further split as follows:

² As will be shown in Section VII, the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory can be written as a generalized Chern-Simons theory involving a multiform connection. Unfortunately, such a multiform formulation of the theory makes it even more difficult to construct global observables.

³ The issue of global observables in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is currently under study, and the results will be presented in a companion paper

- a1) If the fields Σ and A are parallel, i.e. if $\epsilon^{ijk} A_j \wedge \Sigma_k = 0$, then the dynamics of the 2-form fields Σ decouples from the dynamics of the triad and the spin connection, and we recover pure gravity in (2+1) dimensions in an arbitrary background field Σ .
- a2) If the fields Σ and A are not parallel, i.e. if $\epsilon^{ijk} A_j \wedge \Sigma_k \neq 0$, the dynamics of the 2-form field cannot be decoupled from the dynamics of gravity anymore, and the solution will contain three sets of dynamically interacting fields.

b. The case Φ is timelike.

In this case the field Φ can be put in the form $\Phi = (\Phi^0, 0, 0)$, and it follows immediately from the equations of motion (11) that in fact Φ^0 must be a constant and $A_1 = A_2 = 0$.

c. The case Φ is spacelike.

This case is very similar to the timelike case. The field Φ can be put in the form $\Phi = (0, \Phi^1, 0)$, and it follows immediately from the equations of motion (11) that in fact Φ^1 must be a constant and $A_0 = A_2 = 0$.

d. The case Φ is null.

As mentioned earlier, in this case, the classification of the orbits can be further split based on whether the field Φ is futurelike or pastlike. Since the analysis of the solutions in the two cases is very similar, we will only consider the case where Φ is pastlike null with the form $\Phi = (-\phi, \phi, 0)$. Under these circumstances, it follows from the field equations (11) that ϕ is a constant field, and the spin connection fields are such that $A^2 = 0$ and $A^0 = -A^1$. Introducing the notation $\tilde{A} = A^0$, $\tilde{E} = E^0 + E^1$, $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma^0 + \Sigma^1$, the equations of motion (11) now become:

$$\begin{aligned}
d\tilde{A} &= 0; \quad d\tilde{E} = 0; \quad d\tilde{\Sigma} = 0 \\
\tilde{A} \wedge E^2 - \Sigma^2 \phi &= 0 \\
\tilde{A} \wedge \Sigma^2 &= 0 \\
dE^2 + \tilde{A} \wedge \tilde{E} + \tilde{\Sigma} \phi &= 0 \\
d\Sigma^2 - \tilde{A} \wedge \tilde{\Sigma} &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

V. EXAMPLES OF SOLUTIONS

A. Black-hole solution of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ Model

In this section, we show that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model admits the BTZ black-hole geometry as a solution, and we calculate the the conserved Noether charges associated with this solution. For more details regarding the BTZ black-hole, the reader should consult [9], [10].

1. The BTZ black-hole solution

The BTZ black-hole geometry can be described by the triad fields [4], [10]:

$$\begin{aligned} E^0 &= \sqrt{\nu^2(r) - 1} \left(\frac{r_+}{l} dt - r_- d\phi \right) \\ E^1 &= \frac{l}{\nu(r)} d[\sqrt{\nu^2(r) - 1}] \\ E^2 &= \nu(r) \left(-\frac{r_-}{l} dt + r_+ d\phi \right) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_+^2 &= \frac{Ml^2}{2} \{1 + \sqrt{1 - (J/Ml)^2}\} \\ r_-^2 &= \frac{Ml^2}{2} \{1 - \sqrt{1 - (J/Ml)^2}\} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

are the outer and respectively inner horizon radii, satisfying $r_+ r_- = Jl/2$, the function $\nu(r)$ is given by the expression:

$$\nu^2(r) = \frac{r^2 - r_-^2}{r_+^2 - r_-^2} \quad (24)$$

and the parameters M , J and l have the same significance as described in Section II.

In order to find the matter fields of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory associated with the the geometry of the black hole, one has to solve the equations of motion (11) with the triad fields given by (22). For simplicity we will solve the equations of motion in the gauge $A^i = 0$. With appropriate rescaling, a class of matter fields that can be obtained in this way is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\Phi} &= (0, 1, 0) \\ \Sigma^0 &= \frac{r}{2\beta\sqrt{r^2 - r_+^2}} \left\{ \frac{r_+}{l} dr \wedge dt - r_- dr \wedge d\phi \right\} \\ \Sigma^1 &= \text{arbitrary closed 1-form} \\ \Sigma^2 &= \frac{r}{2\beta\sqrt{r^2 - r_-^2}} \left\{ -\frac{r_-}{l} dr \wedge dt - r_+ dr \wedge d\phi \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

As can be immediately observed from (25) the black-hole solution in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model differs significantly from the corresponding solution in the BCEA theory, since in the latter case there is no arbitrariness in the matter fields once the gauge for the spin connection coefficients has been fixed. In other words, the black-hole solution has additional gauge freedom in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory as compared to its BCEA counterpart, and this additional gauge freedom is directly related to the 0-form/2-form choice for the matter fields.

2. The Noether charges for the BTZ black-hole solution

Since the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is a topological theory, its diffeomorphism invariance is equivalent on-shell with invariance under the infinitesimal gauge transformations (12). Hence one can use the formalism developed in [4] to calculate the Noether charges associated with its symmetries.

We begin by first summarizing the formalism in [4]. Assuming the Lagrangian density to be a functional $\mathbf{L}[\beta]$ of generic fields β , under a first order arbitrary variation of these fields the corresponding variation of the Lagrangian density can be written as:

$$\delta\mathbf{L}[\beta] = d\Theta[\beta, \delta\beta] \quad (26)$$

where in writing (26) we have already taken the equations of motion into account. The 2-form (confining ourselves to the 3-dimensional case) $\Theta[\beta, \delta\beta]$ appearing in the RHS of (26) is called the symplectic potential current density and will play a major role in the construction of the symplectic structure of the theory. Similarly, under a symmetry transformation of the fields $\delta_g\beta$, where g is an element of the symmetry group G , the invariance of the Lagrangian density can be expressed as:

$$\delta_g\mathbf{L}[\beta] = d\alpha[\beta, \delta_g\beta] \quad (27)$$

where now α is some arbitrary 2-form. Using now the two forms Θ and α , we can construct the 2-form:

$$\mathbf{j}[g] = \Theta[\beta, \delta_g\beta] - \alpha[\beta, \delta_g\beta] \quad (28)$$

and it is clear that this 2-form is closed when the equations of motion are satisfied. The 2-form $\mathbf{j}[g]$ is nothing other than the Hodge dual of the Noether current associated with the symmetry generated by the symmetry group element $g \in G$, and its integral over a Cauchy surface $\mathcal{C}$ yields the conserved charges $q[g]$ associated associated with the symmetry

generated by g . Furthermore, if $\mathbf{j}[g]$ is also exact then $\mathbf{j}[g] = d\mathbf{Q}[g]$, and the surface integral over $\mathcal{C}$ reduces to a line integral over $\partial\mathcal{C}$.

Referring now to the case of diffeomorphism invariance, the symmetry transformation of the fields in this case is given by $\delta_\xi\beta = \mathcal{L}_\xi\beta$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the Lie derivative operator, and ξ is the diffeomorphism generating vector field. Under these circumstances it can be shown that the dual Noether current (28) can be put in the form:

$$\mathbf{j}[\xi] = \Theta[\beta, \mathcal{L}_\xi\beta] - \xi \cdot \mathbf{L} \quad (29)$$

where the dot in (29) denotes the contraction of the vector field ξ with the first index of the Lagrangian density 3-form. For the particular case of diffeomorphisms generated by asymptotic time translations t^μ and by asymptotic rotations φ^μ , it has been shown [11], [12], [13], that the corresponding conserved charges, i.e. the canonical energy and the canonical angular momentum are given by the line integrals along a circle at constant time and infinite radius according to the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= \int_\infty (\mathbf{Q}[t] - t \cdot G) \\ \mathcal{J} &= \int_\infty \mathbf{Q}[\varphi] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

provided one can determine the 2-form G from the condition:

$$\delta_0 \int_\infty t \cdot G = \int_\infty t \cdot \Theta[\beta, \delta_0\beta] \quad (31)$$

where δ_0 are variations of the fields within the space of solutions of the theory.

Specializing now to the case of the BTZ black-hole solution in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model, it is straightforward to show that the symplectic potential current density Θ is given by the expression:

$$\Theta[\Sigma, E, \delta A, \delta\Phi] = \Sigma^i \wedge \delta\Phi_i - E^i \wedge \delta A_i \quad (32)$$

and since on-shell the Lagrangian of the theory is obviously zero, the Noether dual current for the case of diffeomorphisms is simply:

$$\mathbf{j}[\xi] = \Sigma^i \wedge \mathcal{L}_\xi\Phi_i - E^i \wedge \mathcal{L}_\xi A_i \quad (33)$$

and the conserved Noether charges in (30) are determined exclusively by the 1-form $\mathbf{Q}$.

On-shell, the diffeomorphisms are equivalent to the gauge transformations (12), which

enables us to write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi_i &= \epsilon_{ijk} \Phi^j \tau^k \\ \mathcal{L}_\xi A_i &= D\tau_i\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

where $\tau^i = \xi \cdot A^i$, and with (34), it is straightforward to show that if the equations of motion are satisfied, the dual Noether current (33) becomes simply:

$$\mathbf{j}[\tau(\xi)] = d(E^i \tau_i)\tag{35}$$

Under these circumstances the 1-form $\mathbf{Q}$ is given by the expression:

$$\mathbf{Q} = E^i \tau_i\tag{36}$$

and since the gauge parameters τ^i are proportional to the connection fields A^i , it is clear that for the BTZ black-hole solution $\tau^i = 0$, which in turn means that $\mathbf{Q} = 0$, and hence the conserved Noether charges vanish identically:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Sigma\Phi EA} = \mathcal{J}_{\Sigma\Phi EA} = 0\tag{37}$$

This result is extremely interesting, especially if we correlate it with the corresponding result for the BTZ black-hole solution in the BCEA model. While we do not have a more fundamental understanding of this effect, a possible explanation could be that the Noether charges and correspondingly the original gravitational fields of the black-hole are "screened" (to be thought of in a "generalized" sense) by the topological matter fields, very much like electric charges are being screened by other configurations of charges or alternatively, in the macroscopic sense, like electromagnetic fields being screened (even up to extinction) by matter. However, such an explanation suffers from the obvious drawback that such screening of charges requires charges of opposite signs, and while an opposite angular momentum is a realistic interpretation, an "opposite" mass/energy is a rather unacceptable concept.

B. Cosmological solutions of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model

A very particular feature of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model is that for the sector of the theory for which Φ is timelike, the model admits cosmological solutions of the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker

type. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first class of topological matter models in (2+1) dimensions that exhibits such characteristics.

Consider the equations of motion (11) for the model. In the gauge $A^i = 0$, if Φ is constant and pure timelike, they reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned} dE^0 &= 0 \\ dE^1 - \Sigma^2 \Phi^0 &= 0 \\ dE^2 + \Sigma^1 \Phi^0 &= 0 \\ d\Sigma^i &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

and consider a (2+1)-dimensional Friedman-Robertson-Walker type of metric:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + f(t)dx^2 \tag{39}$$

where dx^2 is a 2-dimensional spatial metric, and $f(t)$ is an arbitrary function of time. For such a metric, we can always choose $E^0 = 1$, in which case the first of the equations of motion in (38) is satisfied identically. Furthermore, for any well behaved 2-dimensional spatial metric that allows us to determine E^1 and E^2 in a closed and convenient form, it is obvious from the rest of the equations of motion in (38) that we can also find two fields Σ^1 and Σ^2 such that these two equations of motion are also satisfied. These latter two fields will be obviously given by the expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^1 &= -\frac{dE^2}{\Phi^0} \\ \Sigma^2 &= \frac{dE^1}{\Phi^0} \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

VI. THE GLOBAL CHARGES OF THE $\Sigma\Phi EA$ MODEL

Besides the gauge invariant observables in the bulk that can be constructed from the fields of the theory, there is another class of observables that are associated with the boundaries of the spacelike surface S . In the dedicated terminology, these observables are called global charges, and they arise from the requirement that the symmetry generators of the theory be differentiable. In the following, we will analyze these global charges, and the algebra they generate.

Before proceeding with the analysis, it is necessary to make some remarks regarding the

boundaries of the spacelike surface S . In the general case the boundary of S can consist of several disconnected components, which can be internal (e.g. the horizon of a black hole) or external (e.g. asymptotic boundaries at spatial infinity). For the time being however, we will restrict ourselves only to the case where the spacelike surface S has a single boundary, which will be considered to have the topology of a circle, and we will make no distinction of whether the boundary is internal or external. The generalization to multiple disconnected components is straightforward, and we will specialize the analysis to each type of boundary - internal or external - in the appropriate context.

A. Field independent gauge parameters

Consider once again the constraints (14) of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model. For reasons that will become clear below, it is more convenient at this time to revert to the notation K^{iA} for the constraints Q^i, R^i and to write the constraints in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} J^i &= D_{[1}E_{2]}^i - 2\epsilon^{ijk}\Sigma_{j12}\Phi_k \approx 0 \\ P^i &= \partial_{[1}A_{2]}^i + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk}A_{j[1}A_{k2]} \approx 0 \\ K_A^i &= D_A\Phi^i \approx 0 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where in (41) we have used the notation $D_A = \partial_A + \epsilon^{ijk}A_{jA}$

With these constraints we can construct the following three types of smeared gauge symmetry generators:

$$\begin{aligned} G_J[\alpha] &= \int_S d^2x \alpha_i J^i \\ G_P[\beta] &= \int_S d^2x \beta_i P^i \\ G_K[\gamma] &= \int_S d^2x \gamma_i \wedge K^i \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where α_i, β_i and γ_i are 0-form and respectively 1-form field-independent gauge parameters on the spacelike surface S . As defined above however, these generators are not differentiable, and it is straightforward to show that under a variation of the fields, the variation of these

generators contains boundary terms that preclude their differentiability:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta G_J[\alpha] &= \int_S d^2x \left\{ -\epsilon^{AB} [(D_A \alpha_i)(\delta E_B^i) + \epsilon^{ijk} [\alpha_i (\delta A_{jA}) E_{kB} - \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2\alpha_i (\delta \Sigma_{j12}) \Phi_k - 2\alpha_i \Sigma_{j12} (\delta \Phi_k)] \right\} + \int_{\partial S} dx^A \alpha_i (\delta E_A^i) \\
\delta G_P[\beta] &= \int_S d^2x [\epsilon^{AB} (D_A \beta_i)(\delta A_B^i)] + \int_{\partial S} dx^A \beta_i (\delta A_A^i) \\
\delta G_K[\gamma] &= \int_S d^2x \left\{ \epsilon^{AB} [(D_A \gamma_{iB})(\delta \Phi^i) - \epsilon^{ijk} \gamma_{iA} (\delta A_{jB}) \Phi_k] \right\} - \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \gamma_{iA} (\delta \Phi^i)
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where ∂S is the boundary of S .

The most straightforward way to make these generators differentiable would be, of course, to simply add to each of the variations in (43) a boundary term [infinitesimal(global) charge] that cancels the already existing one, i.e. to add to each of the $\delta G_J[\alpha]$, $\delta G_P[\beta]$, $\delta G_K[\gamma]$ the following corresponding terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta Q_J[\alpha] &= - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \alpha_i (\delta E_A^i) \\
\delta Q_P[\beta] &= - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \beta_i (\delta A_A^i) \\
\delta Q_K[\gamma] &= \int_{\partial S} dx^A \gamma_{iA} (\delta \Phi^i)
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

In the general case, this approach does not entirely solve the differentiability problem of the gauge symmetry generators unless the infinitesimal charges in (44) are integrable. For the case of field-independent gauge parameters however, the infinitesimal charges in (44) can be integrated straightforwardly to yield (up to integration constants which can be chosen to vanish):

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_J[\alpha] &= - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \alpha_i E_A^i \\
Q_P[\beta] &= - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \beta_i A_A^i \\
Q_K[\gamma] &= \int_{\partial S} dx^A \gamma_{iA} \Phi^i
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

and consequently, with the global charges in (45), one can define a set of differentiable smeared gauge symmetry generators through the relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G}_J[\alpha] &= G_J[\alpha] + Q_J[\alpha] \\ \tilde{G}_P[\beta] &= G_P[\beta] + Q_P[\beta] \\ \tilde{G}_K[\gamma] &= G_K[\gamma] + Q_K[\gamma]\end{aligned}\tag{46}$$

These differentiable generators have now well-defined Poisson brackets with themselves and with any other differentiable functional of the fields, and it is a simple exercise to show that they generate the infinitesimal gauge transformations (12).

The next necessary step in determining the algebra of global charges is to calculate the Poisson brackets of the generators in (46) with themselves. Since the canonically conjugate variables of the theory are (A, E) and (Σ, Φ) , a straightforward calculation yields only three non-trivial such brackets:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_J[\tau]\}_{PB} &= \int_S d^2x [\epsilon_{imn} \alpha^i \tau^m J^n] - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \epsilon_{imn} \alpha_i \tau^m E_A^n \\ \{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_P[\beta]\}_{PB} &= \int_S d^2x [\epsilon_{imn} \alpha^i \beta^m P^n] + \int_{\partial S} dx^a \alpha_i (D_a \beta^i) \\ \{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_K[\gamma]\}_{PB} &= \int_S d^2x [\epsilon_{imn} \alpha^i \gamma_1^m K_2^n - \epsilon_{imn} \alpha^i \gamma_2^m K_1^n] + \int_{\partial S} dx^A \epsilon_{imn} \alpha_i \gamma_A^m \Phi^n\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

Comparing now the boundary terms in (47) with the expression of the global charges in (45), one can immediately see that the algebra of the differential generators closes under the Poisson bracket, and can be rewritten more compactly in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_J[\tau]\}_{PB} &= \tilde{G}_J[[\alpha, \tau]] \\ \{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_P[\beta]\}_{PB} &= \tilde{G}_P[[\alpha, \beta]] + \int_{\partial S} dx^A \alpha_i (\partial_A \beta^i) \\ \{\tilde{G}_J[\alpha], \tilde{G}_K[\gamma]\}_{PB} &= \tilde{G}_K[[\beta, \gamma]]\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

where in (48) we have used the notation $[\alpha, \beta] \equiv \epsilon_{ijk} \alpha^i \beta^j$. Since the boundary term still remaining in (48) is independent of the fields, the above algebra can be interpreted as some sort of central extension of an infinite dimensional version of a Poincaré algebra inhomogeneized by an additional set of translations. Alternatively, it can also be viewed as the central extension of a Kač-Moody algebra inhomogeneized by two (infinite) sets of abelian “translation” generators.

Having cast the algebra of the differentiable generators into a closed form, the global charges will obey the same algebra, with the only difference that the Poisson brackets are replaced by the corresponding Dirac brackets [14]. Therefore, the Dirac algebra of the charges will be given by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q_J[\alpha], Q_J[\tau]\}_D &= Q_J[[\alpha, \tau]] \\ \{Q_J[\alpha], Q_P[\beta]\}_D &= Q_P[[\alpha, \beta]] + \int_{\partial S} dx^a \alpha_i (\partial_a \beta^i) \\ \{Q_J[\alpha], Q_K[\gamma]\}_D &= Q_K[[\alpha, \gamma]]\end{aligned}\tag{49}$$

with all the rest of the Dirac brackets vanishing.

So far, we have described the algebra of the smeared constraints and the corresponding algebra of global gauge charges for the theory formulated on the Lorentz group/algebra, i.e. for the theory whose action is defined as the trace over antisymmetric products of Lorentz algebra-valued forms. It is possible, however (and also convenient for the discussion of the global diffeomorphism charges, as it will become clear in the next section), to reformulate the theory as a theory on the Poincaré group/algebra, and discuss the global charges within this new framework.

In order to reformulate the theory with the Poincaré group/algebra, one must first note that the pure gravity term in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ action (9) can be written, up to surface terms, as a Chern-Simons action with the Poincaré connection:

$$\mathcal{A} = A_i \bar{J}^i + E_i \bar{P}^i = \mathcal{A}_a T^a\tag{50}$$

where latin indices from the beginning of the alphabet $\{a, \dots, h\}$ are Poincaré Lie algebra indices taking the values $\{0, \dots, 5\}$, and $\{T^a\} = \{\bar{J}^0, \dots, \bar{P}^2\}$ are the generators of the Poincaré algebra. Defining now the Poincaré matter fields:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma &= \Sigma_i \bar{J}^i = \Sigma_a T^a \\ \Phi &= \Phi_i \bar{P}^i = \Phi_a T^a\end{aligned}\tag{51}$$

and the Poincaré covariant derivative as:

$$\tilde{D}\Phi = d\Phi + [\mathcal{A}, \Phi]\tag{52}$$

the action (9) can be rewritten as a Chern-Simons action with the Poincaré connection (50) plus a Poincaré topological matter term:

$$S[\Sigma, \Phi, E, A] = \int_M Tr \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A} d\mathcal{A} + \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}^3 + \Sigma \wedge \tilde{D}\Phi \right]\tag{53}$$

where in (53) the wedge product of forms in the Chern-Simons terms is implicitly assumed, and the trace $\tilde{T}r$ is the non-degenerate invariant bilinear form on the Poincaré algebra defined in terms of the Lorentz algebra generators as:

$$\tilde{T}r(\bar{J}^i \bar{P}^j) = \eta^{ij}, \quad \tilde{T}r(\bar{J}^i \bar{J}^j) = 0, \quad \tilde{T}r(\bar{P}^i \bar{P}^j) = 0. \quad (54)$$

Within the Poincaré formulation, and using the notations developed for the Lorentz formulation of the theory, one can define a Poincaré constraint:

$$G = P_i \bar{J}^i + J_i \bar{P}^i = G_a T^a \quad (55)$$

together with a Poincaré gauge parameter:

$$\lambda = \alpha_i \bar{J}^i + \beta_i \bar{P}^i = \lambda_a T^a \quad (56)$$

Consequently, using these two quantities, one can define a Poincaré symmetry generator:

$$G_{JP}[\lambda] = \int_S d^2x \lambda_a G^a \quad (57)$$

and it is a matter of straightforward calculation to show that:

$$G_{JP}[\lambda] = G_J[\alpha] + G_P[\beta] \quad (58)$$

In a similar manner, by defining the Poincaré 1-form constraint:

$$K = K_i \bar{P}^i = K_a T^a \quad (59)$$

and the Poincaré 1-form gauge parameter:

$$\gamma = \gamma_i \bar{J}^i = \gamma_a T^a \quad (60)$$

the gauge symmetry generator $G_K[\gamma]$ can be rewritten as a Poincaré symmetry generator:

$$G_K[\gamma] = \int_s d^2x \gamma_i \wedge K^i = \int_s d^2x \gamma_a \wedge K^a \quad (61)$$

where, for obvious reasons we are using the same notation for this generator in both formulations.

Having the two Poincaré symmetry generators above, we can repeat or translate the previous analysis regarding their differentiability. For the case of field-independent gauge

parameters λ, γ , the differentiability of these generators is ensured by adding to them corresponding global charges:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{JP}[\lambda] &= - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \lambda_a \mathcal{A}_A^a \\ Q_K[\gamma] &= \int_{\partial S} dx^A \gamma_A^a \Phi_a \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

and consequently one can define differentiable gauge symmetry generators:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{JP}[\lambda] &= G_{JP}[\lambda] + Q_{JP}[\lambda] \\ \tilde{G}_K[\gamma] &= G_K[\gamma] + Q_K[\gamma] \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

which now have well-defined Poisson brackets with themselves and with any other differentiable functional of the fields.

The Poisson algebra of these generators can be straightforwardly calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\tilde{G}_{JP}[\lambda], \tilde{G}_{JP}[\eta]\}_{PB} &= \tilde{G}_{JP}[[\lambda, \eta]] - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \lambda_a (\partial_A \eta^a) \\ \{\tilde{G}_{JP}[\lambda], \tilde{G}_K[\gamma]\}_{PB} &= \tilde{G}_K[[\lambda, \beta]] \\ \{\tilde{G}_K[\gamma], \tilde{G}_K[\bar{\gamma}]\}_{PB} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

which in turn yields the Dirac algebra of global charges:

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q_{JP}[\lambda], Q_{JP}[\eta]\}_D &= Q_{JP}[[\lambda, \eta]] - \int_{\partial S} dx^A \lambda_a (\partial_A \eta^a) \\ \{Q_{JP}[\lambda], Q_K[\gamma]\}_D &= Q_K[[\lambda, \gamma]] \\ \{Q_K[\gamma], Q_K[\bar{\gamma}]\}_D &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where in (64,65), the commutator of gauge parameters stands for $[\lambda, \eta] = f_{abc} \lambda^a \eta^b$, with f_{abc} the structure constants of the Poincaré algebra.

It is clear now, in the Poincaré formulation, that the Dirac algebra of global charges is an inhomogenization of the Kač-Moody algebra of charges (with a central term) for pure gravity. Indeed, if we "turn off" the matter fields, and consequently the symmetry generator $\tilde{G}_K$, we are only left with the first Poisson bracket in (64) and respectively with the first Dirac bracket in (65), and the latter can be recognized once again as the algebra of global gauge charges for gravity in (2+1) dimensions [14]. Furthermore, it is also clear from the form of the Dirac algebra of charges, and in fact also from the Poisson algebra of the gauge symmetry generators, that the inhomogeneization of the respective algebras is of Poincaré

type (semi-direct product type), i.e. the Lorentz-like algebra with central charge is inhomogenized by a set of Poincaré-like abelian translations.

In order to better illustrate the above considerations, and also in order to put the algebra of charges (65) in a form that is more amenable to the traditional Dirac quantization procedure it is useful to consider the Fourier modes of the free fields on the boundary ∂S . Since these fields are considered to be periodic on the boundary (which in the following will be assumed to be a circle with the periodic coordinate φ) they admit the following Fourier series expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_\varphi^a &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} B_n^a e^{in\varphi} \\ \Phi^a &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} C_n^a e^{in\varphi}\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

and in terms of the Fourier modes of the fields, the algebra of global charges now becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\{B_n^a, B_m^b\}_D &= -f_c^{ab} B_{n+m}^c + in g^{ab} \delta_{n+m} \\ \{B_n^a, C_m^b\}_D &= -f_c^{ab} C_{n+m}^c \\ \{C_n^a, C_m^b\}_D &= 0\end{aligned}\tag{67}$$

where f_c^{ab} are the structure constants of the Poincaré algebra whose indices are raised and lowered with the the Cartan-Killing metric $g^{ab} = \tilde{T}r(\gamma^a \gamma^b)$.

The first bracket in (67) can be recognized at once as the traditional central extension of the Kač-Moody algebra of gauge charges of pure gravity. As it is now obvious, the central extension of the Kač-Moody is further inhomogeneized by the generators C_n^a that form an infinite dimensional abelian algebra, and whose brackets with the Kač-Moody generators resemble (up to a sign) the brackets of the Poincaré translation generators with the generators of Lorentz rotations.

Following now Dirac's quantization procedure, the quantum algebra of the operators $\hat{B}_n^a$, $\hat{C}_n^a$ is obtained by promoting the Fourier modes of the fields to operators and by defining the quantum commutators as $(-i)$ times the corresponding Dirac brackets. The resulting operator algebra is therefore given by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned}[\hat{B}_n^a, \hat{B}_m^b] &= if_c^{ab} \hat{B}_{n+m}^c + n g^{ab} \delta_{n+m} \\ [\hat{B}_n^a, \hat{C}_m^b] &= -f_c^{ab} \hat{C}_{n+m}^c \\ [\hat{C}_n^a, \hat{C}_m^b] &= 0\end{aligned}\tag{68}$$

B. Field-dependent gauge parameters

We now consider the case of diffeomorphisms, and for simplicity reasons, we will investigate this case in the Poincaré formulation of the theory. It is a known fact that for topological field theories the diffeomorphism symmetries are equivalent on-shell to gauge symmetries with field-dependent gauge parameters. Under these circumstances, and since in the following we are only interested in the case of spatial diffeomorphisms, for this case the diffeomorphisms can be represented by gauge transformations whose gauge parameters depend on the fields of the theory through the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^a &= v \cdot \mathcal{A}^a = v^A \mathcal{A}_A^a \\ \gamma^a &= v \cdot \Sigma^a = -v^\varphi \Sigma_{r\varphi}^a dr + v^r \Sigma_{r\varphi}^a d\varphi\end{aligned}\tag{69}$$

where in (69) v is an arbitrary spatial vector, and we have used the notation $A = \{r, \varphi\}$ for the spatial indices of vectors and forms.

Before proceeding with the calculations of the diffeomorphism charges, it is necessary to make a few useful remarks concerning the functional derivatives of the symmetry generators and their Poisson brackets for the case where the gauge parameters depend on the fields as described above. First of all, and referring to the calculations for the field-independent case, when calculating the first order variation of the symmetry generators $G_{JP}[\lambda] \equiv G_{JP}[v]$ and $G_K[\gamma] \equiv G_K[v]$, the field dependence of the gauge parameters will only introduce additional terms proportional to the constraints in the surface integrals, leaving all the boundary terms calculated earlier unchanged. Secondly, the very same thing happens when calculating the Poisson algebra of the differential symmetry generators. Hence, and since we are only interested in the Dirac algebra of global charges, we only have to worry about the processing of the respective boundary terms under the circumstances where the gauge parameters have the field dependence as described in (69). All the rest of the surface terms resulting from the Poisson algebra of the differentiable symmetry generators are proportional to constraints and therefore vanish identically on-shell.

Repeating once again the analysis regarding the differentiability of the symmetry generators for the case of field-dependent parameters, it is easy to see that the differentiability of these generators can be ensured by adding to their first order variation the respective

diffeomorphism infinitesimal charges:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta C_{JP}[v] &= - \int_{\partial S} d\varphi (v^A \mathcal{A}_{aA}) \delta \mathcal{A}_\varphi^a \\ \delta C_K[v] &= \int_{\partial S} d\varphi (v \cdot \Sigma^a)_\varphi \delta \Phi_a = \int_{\partial S} d\varphi (v^r \Sigma_{r\varphi}^a) \delta \Phi_a\end{aligned}\quad (70)$$

where in (70) we have explicitly considered that the boundary ∂S is a circle with (r, φ) the radial and respectively angular coordinates, and we have used the notations $C_{JP}[v]$ and $C_K[v]$ for the diffeomorphism charges in order to distinguish them from the ones determined in the field independent case.

Having found these infinitesimal charges only solves half of the differentiability problem of the symmetry generators, since in order to define such differentiable generators we must also determine the conditions under which the infinitesimal charges are integrable. It is clear from (70) that these two infinitesimal charges are not trivially integrable anymore as in the field-independent case, and for this reason we need to address the issue of integrability of each of these charges separately.

Consider the infinitesimal charge $\delta C_{JP}[v]$ in (70). By imposing the traditional $SL(2, R)$ boundary condition [14]:

$$\delta \mathcal{A}_r^a = 0 \quad (71)$$

i.e. by fixing the radial components of the Poincaré connection on the boundary ∂S (which works equally well for our present purposes), this infinitesimal charge can be integrated to yield:

$$C_{JP} = - \int_{\partial S} d\varphi \left[v^r \mathcal{A}_{ar} \mathcal{A}_\varphi^a + \frac{1}{2} v^\varphi \mathcal{A}_{a\varphi} \mathcal{A}_\varphi^a \right] + C_{JP}^0 \quad (72)$$

where C_{JP}^0 is a functional integration "constant" which will be specified at a later time. With the diffeomorphism charge (72), one can immediately define the differentiable diffeomorphism symmetry generator:

$$\tilde{G}_{JP}[v] = G_{JP}[v] + Q_{JP}[v] \quad (73)$$

and from this point on, the calculation of the Poisson algebra of this constraint with itself, and the corresponding Dirac algebra of the diffeomorphism charges is standard [14], [15]. A rather straightforward calculation yields for the Poisson bracket of this constraint with itself the expression:

$$\left\{ \tilde{G}_{JP}[v], \tilde{G}_{JP}[w] \right\}_{P.B.} = \tilde{G}_{JP}[[v, w]^A] + \int_{\partial S} d\varphi \mathcal{A}_{ar} \mathcal{A}_r^a v^r (\partial_\varphi w^r) \quad (74)$$

where in (74) we have used for the Lie bracket of vectors the notation $[v, w]^A = v^B \partial_B w^A - w^B \partial_B v^A$.

Correspondingly, the Dirac algebra of global diffeomorphism charges will be given by the expression:

$$\left\{ C_{JP}[v], C_{JP}[w] \right\}_D = C_{JP}[[v, w]^A] + \int_{\partial S} d\varphi \mathcal{A}_{ar} \mathcal{A}_r^a v^r (\partial_\varphi w^r) \quad (75)$$

and this is, as expected, the traditional central extension of the Virasoro algebra of diffeomorphism charges of pure Poincaré gravity in Chern-Simons formulation. It should be noted that in obtaining (74), (75) the integration “constant” C_{JP}^0 has been chosen such that the boundary term in the r.h.s. of the brackets is independent of the (still unfixed) fields on the boundary. With this choice, the boundary term becomes the usual central charge of the Virasoro algebra.

Consider now the infinitesimal charge $\delta C_K[v]$. A boundary condition, compatible with the classes of solutions for the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory discussed in the previous section to require that the Φ^A fields be constant on the boundary ∂S , i.e. that:

$$\delta\Phi^a = 0 \quad (76)$$

With this boundary condition, the infinitesimal charge can be trivially integrated to a functional “constant”, and we have:

$$C_K[v] = C_K^0 \quad (77)$$

The functional integration “constant” need not be vanishing, and for the remainder of this section, we will assume that $C_K^0 \neq 0$.

Of course, we can formally define the differentiable symmetry generator:

$$\tilde{G}_K[v] = G_K[v] + C_K^0 \quad (78)$$

and we can proceed to calculate the Poisson brackets of this generator with itself and with the previous generator $G_{JP}[v]$. The Poisson bracket of $\tilde{G}_K[v]$ with itself is trivial, and can be read off directly from the corresponding bracket in (64):

$$\{\tilde{G}_K[v], \tilde{G}_K[w]\}_{PB} = 0 \quad (79)$$

The Poisson bracket with the Poincaré generator $G_{JP}[v]$, this bracket can be easily be evaluated if we recall the observations made in the beginning of this subsection. According

to these observations, the bracket we are interested in will contain a surface integral whose integrand is a linear combination of the constraints of the theory, plus the surface term of the corresponding field-independent case in which the constant gauge parameters are replaced by the field dependent ones according to (69). Under these circumstances we can write:

$$\{\tilde{G}_{JP}[v], \tilde{G}_K[w]\}_{PB} = \int_S d^2x [\sim \text{constraints}] + \int_{\partial S} d\varphi f_{abc}(v^A \mathcal{A}_A^a)(w^r \Sigma_{r\varphi}^b) \Phi^c \quad (80)$$

Unfortunately, and in contrast to the field-independent case, the Poisson bracket in (80) cannot be put in a nice closed form that exhibits explicitly the structure of the algebra. For this reason, we will ignore the Poisson algebra of the differentiable diffeomorphism constraints, and will focus on the main goal of this subsection which is the determination of the Dirac algebra of global diffeomorphism charges.

To this end, it is easy to show that on-shell, due to the equations of motion for the Φ^a fields on the boundary (where these fields are constant), the boundary term in (80) vanishes identically. Under these circumstances, it follows from (75), (79) and (80) that the Dirac algebra of the diffeomorphism charges is formally given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \{C_{JP}[v], C_{JP}[w]\}_D &= C_{JP}[[v, w]^A] + \int_{\partial S} d\varphi \mathcal{A}_{ar} \mathcal{A}_r^a v^r (\partial_\varphi w^r) \\ \{C_{JP}[v], C_K[w]\}_D &= 0 \\ \{C_K[v], C_K[w]\}_D &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

As in the case of field-independent gauge parameters, it is traditional to rewrite the algebra of diffeomorphism charges (81) in terms of the Fourier modes of the fields that are free on the boundary. However, before proceeding with any further considerations, it is useful to note that since in (81) the algebra of the Poincaré charges C_{JP} is trivially inhomogenized by an abelian (constant) charge C_K , we only have to worry about the Fourier modes of the Poincaré diffeomorphism charges. This is a very convenient situation indeed, because this issue has been extensively studied in the literature. For these reasons, we will only quote the results that are relevant to our discussion, referring the interested reader for details to [14].

The Fourier modes L_n of the Poincaré charges can be obtained from the Fourier expansion of these charges, and they can be shown to satisfy the Dirac bracket:

$$\{L_n, L_m\}_D = i(n - m)L_{n+m} + i(\mathcal{A}_{ar} \mathcal{A}_r^a) n(n^2 - 1) \delta_{n+m} \quad (82)$$

where it must be kept in mind that $\mathcal{A}_r^a = \alpha^a$ is a constant on the boundary, and therefore $\alpha^2 = \mathcal{A}_{ar}\mathcal{A}_r^a$ plays the role of a classical algebraic charge. In the form (82), the algebra of the Fourier modes can be recognized as the central extension of the classical Virasoro algebra, with the charge given by α^2 .

The quantization of the Virasoro algebra is more involved than the quantization of the previous Kač-Moody algebra, due to operator ordering problems, and for this reason it requires more detailed consideration.

The problems in quantizing the Virasoro algebra arise from the fact that the Virasoro generators L_n are quadratic in the generators of the Kač-Moody algebra. Indeed, this can easily be seen from the expression of the Poincaré charge in (72) if we introduce the Fourier expansion (66) for the boundary connection. Explicitly, we obtain [14]:

$$L_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_m B_{am} B_{n-m}^a + i n \alpha_a B_n^a + \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \delta_n \quad (83)$$

and it is clear from (83) that if we were to construct the operator version of L_n by directly replacing the B_n^a generators with the corresponding quantum operators, we could run into potential singularity issues due to the fact that both Kač-Moody in the quadratic term are evaluated at the same point on the boundary.

The solution to these singularity issues is to use the Sugawara construction. According to this construction [16], one needs to introduce a normal ordering for the operators corresponding to the Kač-Moody algebra generators - traditionally the ordering requires that the operators with positive indices m to be on the right - that will regularize the infinities. However, by simply introducing a normal ordering for the operators associated with the Kač-Moody generators solves only half of the issue of quantizing the Virasoro algebra, for the simple reason that the normal ordered operators ($: L_n :$) obtained through this procedure do not obey the commutation relations of a Virasoro algebra anymore.

Nevertheless, we can solve this last issue by defining the operators:

$$\hat{L}_n = \tilde{\beta} : L_n : + \tilde{a} \delta_n \quad (84)$$

where $(: :)$ stands for normal ordering, $\tilde{\beta} = [1 + \frac{1}{2} Q_2]^{-1}$, $\tilde{a} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \tilde{\beta} (\tilde{\beta} - 1)$, and Q_2 is the quadratic Casimir invariant of the Poincaré algebra in the adjoint representation. The newly defined operators $\hat{L}_n$ now satisfy the quantum Virasoro algebra:

$$[\hat{L}_n, \hat{L}_m] = (n - m) \hat{L}_{n+m} + q n (n^2 - 1) \delta_{n+m} \quad (85)$$

where now q is a quantum central charge which is different from the classical central charge α^2 . For the theory of gravity under present consideration ⁴, it can be shown that the quantum central charge of the quantum Virasoro algebra (85) is in fact given by the expression:

$$q = \alpha^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \quad (86)$$

From (83) it can be seen the quantum global charge contains two terms. The first term which is nothing else than the classical central charge rescaled by the square of the "renormalization" factor β that has been introduced in order to define the operators associated with the Virasoro generators in (84). The second term in the expression of the quantum central charge is the direct consequence of the Sugawara construction, and as such it has an entirely quantum character. It should be noted at this time that due to the fact that the classical Virasoro algebra is trivially inhomogeneized by the abelian algebra of the charges associated with the topological matter fields, it comes at no surprise the fact that the matter fields of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory have no influence upon the quantum central charge of gravity. This is the direct consequence of the boundary conditions that have been chosen in order to determine the diffeomorphism charges.

Having the quantum Virasoro algebra, it is trivial to obtain the quantum algebra of the Fourier modes corresponding to the diffeomorphism charges in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model. it is given by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{L}_n, \hat{L}_m] &= (n-m)\hat{L}_{n+m} + qn(n^2-1)\delta_{n+m} \\ [\hat{L}_n, \hat{C}_K] &= 0 \\ [\hat{C}_K, \hat{C}_K] &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

VII. THE $\Sigma\Phi EA$ MODEL AS A GENERALIZED CHERN-SIMONS THEORY

As noted earlier, it has thus far proven impossible to formulate the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory as either a BF theory or as a traditional Chern-Simons theory. However, as we will prove in the following, the theory can be formulated as a generalized Chern-Simons theory with a

⁴ Of particular importance in the calculation of the quantum charge is the dimension of the Lie algebra underlying the theory of gravity under consideration - in this case the Poincare algebra. For more details about the general dependence of the Virasoro central charge on the dimension of the underlying Lie algebra, the reader is referred to [14], [16].

multiform connection involving both bosonic and fermionic matter fields, defined over an algebra that is not the algebra of the constraints.

In order to understand how such a particular formulation arises naturally for the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory, it is worth to begin by illustrating the difficulties that one faces in reformulation of the theory as a Chern-Simons theory.

The first issue that one must deal with in attempting such a formulation is the form content of the matter fields. Since the matter fields are 0-forms and 2-forms respectively, any generalized connection defined using these fields will necessarily be a multiform connection. This presents a major problem, since such a multiform connection requires generally the introduction of additional de Rham currents in order to be able to define a generalized holonomy over some submanifold of the spacetime manifold, submanifold which usually is not a closed loop, as in the standard Chern-Simons theory.

Furthermore, even if one ignores the above problems, and defines such a multiform generalized connection, for the particular case of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$, if one attempts to define this generalized connection over the Lie algebra generated by the Poisson brackets of the constraints, it is rather obvious that the action of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ cannot be actually written as a Chern-Simons action. This is most easily seen from the following argument. Assume that we define a generalized connection form:

$$\mathcal{A} = A^i \bar{J}_i + E^i \bar{P}_i + \Phi^i \bar{Q}_i + \Sigma^i \bar{R}_i \quad (88)$$

where $(\bar{J}_i, \bar{P}_i, \bar{Q}_i, \bar{R}_i)$ are the generators of the constraint algebra of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model (15), on which we introduce the invariant non-degenerate bilinear form:

$$\tilde{Tr}(\bar{J}^i \bar{P}^j) = \eta^{ij}, \quad \tilde{Tr}(\bar{Q}^i \bar{R}^j) = \eta^{ij}, \quad (89)$$

with all the rest of the pairings vanishing. When calculating the derivative term $\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A}$ in the Chern-Simons action, it will contain explicitly the terms $\frac{1}{2} (\Phi^i \wedge d\Sigma_i + \Sigma^i \wedge d\Phi_i)$, and by using integration by parts these terms combined should yield the term $\Sigma^i \wedge d\Phi_i$ as the first component of the covariant derivative of the topological matter fields in the action and an additional surface term. It is clear however that due to the form content of the above terms involving the topological matter fields, the integration by parts will only yield a surface term since the two resulting terms involving the exterior derivatives of the fields Σ, Φ will cancel each other. Furthermore, it is also clear from the above argument that in order to be able

to write the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model as a Chern-Simons theory, i.e. in order to recover the component $\Sigma^i \wedge d\Phi_i$ from the "derivative" Chern-Simons term $\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A}$, one must use a formalism which combines either fermionic matter fields with a "regular" Lie algebra, or alternatively, bosonic matter fields with a graded Lie algebra.

Fortunately, such a formalism that generalizes the Chern-Simons theory to include both bosonic and fermionic fields with a graded gauge Lie algebra has been developed [17]. Using this formalism, we will show that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model can be written as such a generalized Chern Simons theory if the topological matter fields are considered to be of the fermionic type.

A. The generalized Chern-Simons formalism

We begin by briefly reviewing the generalized Chern-Simons formalism developed by Kawamoto and Watabiki [17], whose original purpose was to both extend the Chern-Simons formalism to higher-dimensional spacetime manifolds, and at the same time to extend it to higher order tensorial connections, even in (2+1)-dimensional spacetimes.

One starts with a generalized connection form $\mathcal{A}$ and a generalized gauge parameter ν that include both bosonic and fermionic type of fields, which are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &= \mathbf{1}F + \mathbf{i}\tilde{F} + \mathbf{j}B + \mathbf{k}\tilde{B} \\ \nu &= \mathbf{1}\tilde{b} + \mathbf{i}b + \mathbf{j}\tilde{f} + \mathbf{k}f\end{aligned}\tag{90}$$

where f, F are fermionic odd-rank form fields, $\tilde{f}, \tilde{F}$ are fermionic even-rank form fields, b, B are odd-rank bosonic fields, and $\tilde{b}, \tilde{B}$ are bosonic even-form fields. This means for example that the bosonic field B can be written formally as $B = \sum_{p-\text{odd}} B_{(p)}$ where $B_{(p)}$ are p-rank bosonic forms with p odd. Of course, similar such formal relations can be written for each of the fields in (90), with p being, as the definition of the fields dictates, odd or even numbers. The symbols $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k})$ in (90) are the "generators" of the quaternionic "generalized algebra" defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}^2 &= \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbf{i}^2 = \varepsilon_1 \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbf{j}^2 = \varepsilon_2 \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbf{k}^2 = -\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \mathbf{1}, \\ \mathbf{ij} &= -\mathbf{ji} = \mathbf{k}, \quad \mathbf{jk} = -\mathbf{kj} = -\varepsilon_2 \mathbf{k}, \quad \mathbf{ki} = -\mathbf{ik} = -\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{j}.\end{aligned}\tag{91}$$

and the coefficients $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ can take the values $(-1, -1)$,in which case the algebra defined by these generators becomes the traditional quaternion algebra), or $(-1, 1)$, $(1, -1)$, $(1, 1)$

in which case the algebra becomes the $gl(2, R)$ Lie algebra.

One also introduces a graded gauge Lie algebra, with commuting and anticommuting generators (T_m) and (S_μ) respectively, defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\{T_m, T_n\}_- &= c_{mn}{}^p T_p \\ \{T_m, S_\mu\}_- &= g_{m\mu}{}^\nu S_\nu \\ \{S_\mu, T_\nu\}_+ &= h_{\mu\nu}{}^p T_p\end{aligned}\tag{92}$$

where the $\pm$ indices at the right of the Poisson brackets in (92) indicate the commuting and anticommuting character of the brackets involved. The structure constants obey the corresponding graded Jacobi identities. To simplify the notation, in the following we will drop the exterior (wedge) product symbol from the mathematical relations, its existence being implicitly assumed everywhere where multiplication of forms is involved. Also, in order to keep the consistency with the index notations used in the previous sections, at this time we introduce the following conventions. All Latin lower case indices from the end of the alphabet ($m, n, p, \dots$) and all Greek lower case indices are now Lie algebra formal indices, and we will use Latin indices and Greek indices to differentiate between the commuting and anticommuting algebra generators. All sums involving such indices are purely formal in this context, and do not reflect the explicit structure of the gauge Lie algebra and fields involved in the formalism. Later on, when the graded gauge Lie algebra and field structure for the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory are introduced, all the formal expressions will be made explicit by returning to the previous index convention with only latin lower case indices ($i, j, k, \dots$) as Lie algebra indices.

With the graded gauge algebra (92), one introduces the following internal structure for the fermionic and bosonic fields involved in the definition (90) of the generalized connection and gauge parameter:

$$\begin{aligned}F &= F^\mu S_\mu, \quad \tilde{F} = \tilde{F}^m T_m, \quad B = B^m T_m, \quad \tilde{B} = \tilde{B}^\mu S_\mu, \\ f &= f^m T_m, \quad \tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^\mu S_\mu, \quad b = b^\mu S_\mu, \quad \tilde{b} = \tilde{b}^m T_m.\end{aligned}\tag{93}$$

and it should be noted at this time that the model takes into consideration all possible combinations of fields and algebra generators, i.e. bosonic and fermionic fields with commuting/bosonic algebra generators and bosonic and fermionic fields with anticommuting/fermionic algebra generators.

With the structure introduced above, we can now define the generalized Chern-Simons action:

$$S_{gen} = \int_M Tr^* [\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A} Q(\mathcal{A}) + \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}^3] \quad (94)$$

where M is a spacetime manifold having an arbitrary finite dimension, and Q is a nilpotent generalized derivative operator given by the expression:

$$Q = \mathbf{j}d \quad (95)$$

with d the traditional exterior derivative.

The invariant non-degenerate bilinear form Tr^* that appears in the definition of the generalized Chern-Simons action (94) is defined as follows. One first introduces an invariant and non-degenerate (traditional) bilinear form Tr on the graded algebra (92), and once and if such a bilinear form has been introduced, then the extended bilinear form Tr^* is defined as the projection of the terms in the integrand (with the appropriate dimensionality in accordance to the dimension of the spacetime manifold) on one of the generators of the quaternion algebra. For example, if one chooses to use in the trace the projection along $\mathbf{i}$, then one has:

$$Tr^*(\mathcal{A}) \equiv Tr_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{A}) = Pr_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{A}) = \tilde{F} \quad (96)$$

and it is clear from these considerations that with the above definition for the generalized invariant bilinear form, one can in fact have four different such bilinear forms, each corresponding to one of the generators of the generalized quaternionic algebra (91).

Furthermore, such a generalized bilinear form must also obey certain constraints, in order for resulting Chern-Simons formalism to be internally consistent. The principal constraint that must be imposed on the generalized bilinear form derives from the requirement that when calculating the explicit form of the cubic term in the generalized Chern-Simons action, the generalized connection should obey the consistency condition $\mathcal{A}^2 \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^2$. A long but straightforward calculation yields the following conditions that must be obeyed by the generalized bilinear form:

$$\begin{aligned} Tr_{\mathbf{1}}(\{T_m, S_\mu\}_-) &= Tr_{\mathbf{k}}(\{T_m, S_\mu\}_-) = 0 \\ Tr_{\mathbf{i}}(\{T_m, T_n\}_-) &= Tr_{\mathbf{i}}(\{S_\mu, S_\nu\}_+) = 0 \\ Tr_{\mathbf{j}}(\{T_m, T_n\}_-) &= Tr_{\mathbf{j}}(\{S_\mu, S_\nu\}_+) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

and from (97) it is obvious that in fact these consistency conditions on the generalized trace translate in conditions that must be imposed at the level of the traditional non-degenerate invariant bilinear form defined on the graded Lie algebra². Following the notation in [17], this means that we can define two types of bilinear forms on the underlying graded gauge Lie algebra (92). For projections along the quaternionic generators $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{j}$ the trace on the graded gauge algebra is denoted by STr (supersymmetric trace by analogy with traditional supersymmetric theories), while for projections along the quaternionic generators $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{k}$ the trace on the graded gauge algebra is denoted by HTr (heterotic trace).

Under these circumstances, and no matter which component of the quaternion algebra we choose in defining the generalized Chern-Simons action, the equations of motion of (94) are given by the vanishing of the curvature of the generalized connection form:

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \equiv Q(\mathcal{A}) + \mathcal{A}^2 = 0 \quad (98)$$

and the action is invariant under the generalized gauge transformations:

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = Q(\nu) + \{\mathcal{A}, \nu\}_- \quad (99)$$

As mentioned above, one can define four generalized traces for the action (94), depending on which generator of the quaternion algebra is chosen for projection. It is not difficult to see that in this way each of the four resulting actions has a definite dimension type, i.e. corresponds to the action on an odd or even dimensional manifold, and a definite fermionic or bosonic character. For example, if one defines the generalized trace as $Tr^*(...) \equiv Str_{\mathbf{j}}(...)$, following again the syntax in [17], one obtains a bosonic action defined on an odd-dimensional spacetime manifold M . Of course, choosing other quaternionic generator with the appropriate type of trace on the graded gauge algebra, one can also obtain bosonic actions defined on even dimensional spacetime manifolds, and fermionic action defined on even and odd dimensional manifolds, but such actions will not be considered here.

Since the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is a (2+1)-dimensional theory, and since its action is manifestly bosonic, we are only interested in the generalized bosonic Chern-Simons action defined on a

² In the original work of Kawamoto and Watabiki [17], they also require consistency conditions similar to (97) for higher order products of generators of the graded gauge algebra, which are necessary for the gauge invariance of the generalized action. However, in redoing the calculations, we have found no need to introduce such higher order trace conditions.

(2+1)-dimensional manifold defined as above. Choosing the field content of the generalized connection such that it contains only bosonic odd-rank forms and fermionic even-rank forms (i.e. $F = \tilde{B} = 0$), the formal expression of this action in terms of the generators of the graded gauge algebra is given by:

$$S_{bo} = \int_M \text{Str}_{\mathbf{j}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A} Q(\mathcal{A}) + \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}^3 \right] = \int_M \text{Str}[\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{j}}] \quad (100)$$

where the argument of the trace has the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{j}} = & \{ \varepsilon_2 \left[\frac{1}{2} B^m dB^n + \frac{1}{6} c_{pq}{}^m B^p B^q B^n \right] (T_m T_n) - \varepsilon_1 \left[\frac{1}{2} \tilde{F}^m d\tilde{F}^n + \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{3} (c_{pq}{}^m \tilde{F}^p B^q \tilde{F}^n - \frac{1}{2} c_{pq}{}^m \tilde{F}^p \tilde{F}^q B^n) \right] (T_m T_n) \} \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Having established the relations (100) and (101) we can now proceed with the proof that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model can be written as such a generalized Chern-Simons theory with fermionic topological matter fields.

B. The $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model in the context of the generalized Chern-Simons formalism

The relations (100) and (101) established in the previous section are as far as one can go, within the general framework of the extended formalism developed in [17], in proving that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model can be written as such a Chern-Simons theory. In order to make any further progress it becomes absolutely necessary to introduce the explicit forms of the graded gauge algebra and of the fields appearing in the generalized connection (90).

As far as the field content of the generalized connection is concerned, this issue is quite straightforward. The fields that we have used in obtaining the expression (101) of the odd-dimensional bosonic action are the odd-rank bosonic field B and the even-rank fermionic field $\tilde{F}$ and by simple comparison with the original $\Sigma\Phi EA$ action (9), it is clear that the internal structure of these fields can only be of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} B &= A^i \bar{J}_i + E^i \bar{P}_i \equiv B^m T_m \\ \tilde{F} &= \Phi^i \bar{Q}_i + \Sigma^i \bar{R}_i \equiv \tilde{F}^m T_m \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

where $\{\bar{J}_i, \bar{P}_i\}$ are the generators of the Poincaré algebra, and $\{\bar{Q}_i, \bar{R}_i\}$ are two additional sets of (still commuting/bosonic) generators of the gauge Lie algebra, whose commutation relations have yet to be specified.

After specifying the fields, we are left with the much more difficult task of specifying the underlying gauge algebra. Of course, the only way to determine the “correct” algebra is by trial and error, so what we have to do is to look for an algebra which when inserted in (101) yields as a final result the original $\Sigma\Phi EA$ action (9). By simple examination of (101) and (102), it is clear that the underlying gauge algebra is not a graded algebra, but a regular Lie algebra, and under these circumstances the generalized trace STr reduces to the usual trace on a Lie algebra. Furthermore, it is also clear that this gauge algebra has to be an extension of sorts of the Poincaré algebra, and for this reason it is only natural that we should first check the constraint algebra (15) of the original theory. Unfortunately, it is not very difficult to show that with the constraint algebra (15) on which we have introduced the non-degenerate invariant bilinear form (89), the action (100) does not yield the action (9) of the original $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory.

However, if instead of the constraint algebra of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory we use the constraint algebra (6) of the BCEA model with its non-degenerate invariant bilinear form (89), the situation changes. Using this algebra, and restoring the exterior product symbol and our original index convention where latin lower case indices $(i, j, k, \dots)$ are explicit Lie algebra indices of the dimensionally correct terms in (101), the odd bosonic action (100) with the trace defined by (89) reduces to:

$$S_{bo} = \int_M \{ \varepsilon_2 (E_i \wedge R^i[A] + \frac{1}{2} d[E_i \wedge A^i]) - \varepsilon_1 (\Sigma_i \wedge D\Phi^i + \frac{1}{2} d[\Sigma_i \wedge \Phi^i]) \} \quad (103)$$

and it is clear that by setting $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = (-1, 1)$ in the quaternionic algebra, the action (103) becomes identical (up to surface terms) to the original action (9) of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have considered a model (the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model) of scalar and tensorial topological matter - represented by 0-form and 2-form fields - coupled minimally to gravity in (2+1) dimensions, and we have investigated its classical structure while at the same time comparing it, whenever possible, with a similar model (the BCEA model), involving only 1-form matter fields, that has already been studied in the literature. We have shown that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model has non-trivial classical sectors, in which the dynamics of the matter fields cannot be decoupled from gravity, and we have illustrated these sectors with two

geometries, one corresponding to the BTZ black-hole, and the other one corresponding to FRW homogeneously/inhomogeneously expanding cosmological geometries.

For the case of the BTZ geometry, we have calculated the Noether charges associated with the asymptotic symmetries, and have shown that these charges exhibit similar characteristics to the corresponding charges in the BCEA theory. Explicitly, in the case of the BCEA model, the mass and the angular momentum of the singularity exchange roles in the expressions of the Noether charges, such that the mass parameterizes the conserved angular momentum charge, and the angular momentum parameterizes the conserved energy. One strange implication of this role change of mass and angular momentum is that under certain conditions, the asymptotic mass can become smaller than the mass of the singularity, as if the matter fields were “screening” the mass of the singularity. In the case of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ model, the effect is even more drastic. The conserved charges both vanish, and while this may not be so strange for the angular momentum charge, it is definitely strange for the case of the mass charge. In this case, the mass is completely obscured by the matter fields, to the point where the singularity simply disappears for any asymptotic observer.

At the present time we have no underlying explanation for this mass “screening” effect. It is, however, extremely interesting that a similar effect appears to exist in (3+1)-dimensional gravity when one considers its topological aspects [19], [20]. However, the implications of this apparent similarity for gravity in (3+1) dimensions are not yet known and will require further investigation.

For the case of homogeneously/inhomogeneously expanding FRW geometries, it would appear that the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory is the first theory that admits such solutions in the presence of matter, and as such it would be interesting to pursue this aspect further and in more detail.

While the full issue of quantization of the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory has been deferred to a companion paper [21], we have also studied, as a prelude to the full quantization of the theory, the global gauge charges associated with the constraints. Our analysis has shown that the classical algebras of charges are inhomogeneizations of the corresponding Kač-Moody and Virasoro algebras of pure gravity. Furthermore, we have quantized the resulting charge algebras, and have shown that with the boundary conditions we have chosen, the quantum charge associated with the Virasoro subalgebra of the diffeomorphism algebra in the $\Sigma\Phi EA$

theory is identical to the quantum central charge of pure gravity.

Finally, we have shown that while the $\Sigma\Phi EA$ theory cannot be formulated as either a traditional BF or a Chern-Simons theory - in contrast to the BCEA theory - it is still possible to formulate it as a generalized Chern-Simons theory with a multiform connection containing both bosonic and fermionic matter fields defined over the Lie algebra of $I[ISO(2,1)]$ - which is different from the constraint algebra - with the help of the generalized quaternion algebra as an auxiliary algebra. While this formulation offers an extension of the theory to fermionic fields, more detailed investigation is necessary in order to fully understand its implications. One implication of this formulation, as it is apparent from our analysis if we follow the approach in [22] is that the classical BTZ geometry could be described at the quantum level by a combination of fermionic and bosonic matter fields. Another implication, which is more far more reaching in its consequences is that this formulation could offer the possibility for the generalization of the concept of holonomy to a (multiform) connection and to higher dimensional submanifolds of the spacetime manifold.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank L. Freidel for many useful discussions during the work on this paper, and also to A. Starodubtsev for discussions on the topological character of (3+1)-dimensional gravity. This work was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

-
- [1] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B 311**, 46 (1988-1989).
 - [2] Gary T. Horowitz, Commun. Math. Phys **125**, 417-437 (1989).
 - [3] S. Carlip, J. Gegenberg, Phys. Rev. **D 44**, 424 (1991).
 - [4] S. Carlip, J. Gegenberg, R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. **D 51**, 6854 (1995).
 - [5] J. Gegenberg, G. Kunstatter, H. P. Leivo, Phys. Lett. **B 252(3)**, 381 (1990).
 - [6] C. Teitelboim, M. Henneaux, Quantization of gauge systems, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, (1992).
 - [7] M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, J. Zanelli, Nucl.Phys. **B332**, 169, (1990).

- [8] L. Freidel, R. B. Mann, E. M. Popescu, *Clas.Quant.Grav.* **22**, 3363, (2005).
- [9] M. Banados, C. Teitelboim, J. Zanelli *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1849 (1992); M. Banados, M. Henneaux C. Teitelboim, J. Zanelli *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 1506 (1993).
- [10] D. Cangemi, M. Leblanc and R.B. Mann, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3606 (1993).
- [11] R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3427 (1993).
- [12] J. Lee, R. M. Wald, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 725 (1990).
- [13] V. Iyer, R. M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 846 (1993).
- [14] M. Banados, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5816, (1996).
- [15] Mu-In Park, *Nucl. Phys.* **544**, 377, (1999).
- [16] P. Goddard, D. Olive, "Kač-Moody and Virasoro algebras: A reprint volume for physicists.", *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys.* **3**, World Scientific Publishing Co., (1988).
- [17] N. Kawamoto, Y. Watabiki *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **7**, 1137, (1992).
- [18] D. Birmingham, M. Blau, R. Rakowski, G. Thompson, *Phys. Rep.* **209**, 129, (1991).
- [19] A. Starobubtsev, preprint hep-th/0501191.
- [20] A. Starodubtsev, private communication.
- [21] R. B. Mann, E. M. Popescu in preparation.
- [22] J. M. Izquierdo, P. K. Townsend, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **12**, 895, (1995).